

Sherrie Finkle 274-3363

No.	PAGE/LINE REFERENCE	SOURCE	PROPOSED LANGUAGE/COMMENTS	SBE STAFF POSITION
40	30 32	Sacramento County Assessor's Office (J. Lewis)	Revise sentence: However, if the roof structure is redesigned to accept another roof cover, then that new roof structure is considered <u>assessable</u> new construction.	Accepted
41	31 6	Sacramento County Assessor's Office (J. Lewis)	Revise sentence: The work that was done in constructing the new roof would be considered <u>assessable</u> new construction. It has converted the "portion of" the structure that consists of the roof to a state that is substantially equivalent to new.	Accepted
42	39 2	Marin County Assessor (R. Benson)	<p>Comment: This is a bit unclear as the prior paragraph mentioned January 2003. For clarification purposes, although the cost mentioned on line 2 is for the calendar year 2002, it was reported as of the Lien Date 2003.</p> <p>Revise test: The total cost of construction reported by the owner for 2002 <u>Lien Date 2013</u> (\$100,000) was lower than the local norm (\$115,000). Certain work was done by the owner himself, while other work was done by specialized subcontractors. In either case, most of the reported costs did not reflect the true costs of construction, but represented a discounted cost as the owner used his extensive contacts within the industry to obtain favorable prices from subcontractors and materials suppliers. The appraiser enrolled true economic costs which more accurately reflected market costs.</p> <p>In January 2004, construction in progress was 90 percent complete, with the exception being the basement and yard improvements. Upon final inspection from the building department, the owner and his family moved into their new home on April 1, 2004. Reported cost of construction for 2004 was \$150,000. Total cost reported by the owner to date for improvements was \$100,000 in <u>for Lien Date 2003</u> and \$150,000 in 2004 for a total of \$250,000.</p> <p>The county appraiser informed the owner that the date of completion is the date the property or a portion of it is available for use after final inspection by the appropriate governmental official, in this instance April 1, 2004. Furthermore, the county appraiser advised that on the date of completion, the completed portion of the newly constructed property must be appraised at its full market value. Any subsequent construction would be considered construction in progress and continue to be appraised at its market value on the lien date and every lien date thereafter. The base year value of the land was calculated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition of land in 2001 ————— \$200,000 	<p>Not accepted—a taxpayer does not report construction as of the lien date. The property would have been enrolled on the supplemental assessment roll as of the date of completion in 2002.</p>

Is January 10, 2002 a suppl value date (for what value increment) or is it when appraiser did Lien Date check?

Land Imps \$41,000 sep. increment from 2001 Land B.V.

(confusing)

NO.	PAGE/LINE REFERENCE	SOURCE	PROPOSED LANGUAGE/COMMENTS	SBE STAFF POSITION																																		
42 Cont			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Land improvements \$41,000• 2001 base year value of land \$241,000• 2001 base year value of land \$200,000• 2002 base year value of land improvements \$41,000 <p>The county appraiser used the comparative sales method to estimate a total value of \$800,000. Properties with similar characteristics in the area were selling for \$800,000. Land parcels of similar size were selling for \$300,000. The value of improvements was calculated as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">\$800,000 - \$300,000 = \$500,000*</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*Included an increment for the countywide school fees</p> <p>However, a portion of the \$500,000 value is reflected in the improvements to land. Assuming that the comparable properties have similar characteristics, an adjustment must be made to avoid double assessment</p> <p>The base year value of land and improvements was enrolled as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>2001 base year value of land</td><td>\$241,000</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>\$241,000</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>x 1.05980</td></tr><tr><td>Adjusted base year value of land in 2004</td><td>\$255,412</td></tr><tr><td>2004 base year value of improvements</td><td>\$500,000</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>50,000</td></tr><tr><td>Current market value of improvements to land</td><td>\$450,000</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>\$255,412</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>+\$450,000</td></tr><tr><td>Total Assessed Value</td><td>\$705,412</td></tr><tr><td>2001 base year value of land</td><td>\$200,00</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>x 1.05980</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>\$211,960</td></tr><tr><td>2002 base year value of land</td><td>\$41,000</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>x 1.03904</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>\$42,601</td></tr><tr><td>Adjusted base year value of land in 2004</td><td>\$254,561</td></tr></table>	2001 base year value of land	\$241,000		\$241,000		x 1.05980	Adjusted base year value of land in 2004	\$255,412	2004 base year value of improvements	\$500,000		50,000	Current market value of improvements to land	\$450,000		\$255,412		+\$450,000	Total Assessed Value	\$705,412	2001 base year value of land	\$200,00		x 1.05980		\$211,960	2002 base year value of land	\$41,000		x 1.03904		\$42,601	Adjusted base year value of land in 2004	\$254,561	<p><i>we agree with this</i></p> <p><i>Land Imp have sep. Base Year value (value date 1-10-2002)</i></p>
2001 base year value of land	\$241,000																																					
	\$241,000																																					
	x 1.05980																																					
Adjusted base year value of land in 2004	\$255,412																																					
2004 base year value of improvements	\$500,000																																					
	50,000																																					
Current market value of improvements to land	\$450,000																																					
	\$255,412																																					
	+\$450,000																																					
Total Assessed Value	\$705,412																																					
2001 base year value of land	\$200,00																																					
	x 1.05980																																					
	\$211,960																																					
2002 base year value of land	\$41,000																																					
	x 1.03904																																					
	\$42,601																																					
Adjusted base year value of land in 2004	\$254,561																																					

NO.	PAGE/LINE REFERENCE	SOURCE	PROPOSED LANGUAGE/COMMENTS	SBE STAFF POSITION
42 Cont			<p>2004 base year value of improvements -50,000</p> <p>Current market value of improvement to land \$450,000</p> <p>\$254,561</p> <p>+ \$450,000</p> <p><u>Total Assessed Value</u> <u>\$704,561</u></p> <p>The assessor enrolled a base year value of \$705,412 \$704,561 for the property as of the date of completion of the new construction, April 1, 2004 to the supplemental roll. The allocation was \$450,000 for improvements and \$255,412 \$254,561 for land.</p>	
43	44	21	Marin County Assessor (R. Benson)	Accepted
44	45	1	Sacramento County Assessor's Office (J. Lewis)	Accepted
45	46	19	Sacramento County Assessor's Office (J. Lewis)	Accepted
46	48	11	Sacramento County Assessor's Office (J. Lewis)	Accepted
47	72	13	Sacramento County Assessor's Office (J. Lewis)	Accepted